

### **REMARKS**

Claims 22-24, 27-31, 34-38, and 41-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) under either Park et al. (hereinafter Park), or Trabelsi, US 2001/0056494 (hereinafter Trabelsi). Claims 25-26, 32-33, and 39-40 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 22, 29, and 36. Applicant has also made clarifying amendments to claims 24-25, 31-32, and 38-39. All amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure; no new matter has been introduced. Applicant has also cancelled claims 23, 30, and 37.

Independent claims 22, 29, and 36 now recite:

receiving a request from a user to access the resource using a process having a process path;  
accessing data associated with the user stored in a memory in response to the received request, the data comprising a process resource access table associated with the user and having an ordered list of entries specifying process paths and access rights to resources available to processes having the corresponding paths;  
determining a level of access to the resource for the process by searching the list of entries in order to find a first entry matching the process path; and  
providing the process with access rights to the resource specified by the matching entry.  
(quoting from claim 22).

That the process resource access table includes a process path is supported in the specification at, for example, Table 1 on page 3 and paragraph [0075]. The newly added claim elements related to searching the table in order are supported in the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0038] to [0041], which describe going through the steps in Table 1, and paragraph [0051], which discloses incrementing through an access table in a process flow.

Claims 22, 23, 28-30, 35-37, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Park. At the least, Park does not disclose the newly added limitations of claim 22 (e.g., “a process resource access table associated with the user and having an ordered list of

entries specifying process paths and access rights to resources available to processes having the corresponding paths” or “searching the list of entries in order to find a first entry matching the process path”). For example, while Park describes a table with roles (page 65, first paragraph), Park neither teaches nor suggests that the order of the entries in the table matter, as now recited by claim 22 (“determining a level of access to the resource for the process by searching the list of entries in order to find a first entry matching the process path”). One could reorder the roles in Park’s table without affecting the operation of Park’s system. Moreover, the table in Park is not associated with the user, and the entries in the table do not specify process paths and access rights to resources available to processes having the corresponding paths. Accordingly, claim 22 is patentable over Park. Independent claims 29 and 36 include the limitations of claim 22, and are thus also patentable over Park.

Prior rejected claims 23, 30, and 37 have been cancelled, rendering their rejections under Park moot. Claims 28, 35, and 42 are dependent on either claim 22, 29, or 36, incorporating their limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons as discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 28, 35, and 42 are patentable over Park.

Claims 22-24, 27, 29-31, 34, 36-38, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Trabelsi. At the least, Trabelsi also does not disclose the newly added limitations of claim 22 (e.g., “a process resource access table associated with the user and having an ordered list of entries specifying process paths and access rights to resources available to processes having the corresponding paths” or “searching the list of entries in order to find a first entry matching the process path”). For example, while paragraphs of Trabelsi, e.g., paragraphs [0042]-[0048], describe tables having multiple entries, Trabelsi neither teaches nor suggests that

the order of the entries in the table matter, as now recited by claim 22 (“determining a level of access to the resource for the process by searching the list of entries in order to find a first entry matching the process path”). One could reorder the entries in the tables without affecting the operation of Trabelsi’s system. Moreover, the entries in Trabelsi’s tables are indexed by *resource*, and not *process path*, as claimed. Accordingly, claim 22 is patentable over Trabelsi. Independent claims 29 and 36 include the limitations of claim 22, and are thus also patentable over Trabelsi.

Prior rejected claims 23, 30, and 37 have been cancelled, rendering their rejections under Trabelsi moot. Claims 24, 27, 31, 34, 38, and 41 are dependent on either claim 22, 29, or 36, incorporating their limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons as discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 24, 27, 31, 34, 38, and 41 are patentable over Trabelsi.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 22, 24-29, 31-36, and 38-42 are all in condition for allowance. Issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,  
VINCENT ALAN LARSEN

Dated: November 9, 2006

By: /Pierre Keeley/

Pierre Keeley, Reg. No. 57,045  
Attorney for Applicant  
Fenwick & West LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (650) 335-7242  
Fax: (650) 938-5200